

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

**VENDETTA NAGASK CECE-JACKOWIAK)
AKA; DBA NOEL ALEXIS KAPETANAKOS)
OF MEDICAL AUXILIARY NETWORK,)**

Plaintiff,)

v.)

Case No. 15 C 354

**KONSTANTINOS P. KAPETANAKOS,)
GREGORY P. KAPETANAKOS, THE)
CITY OF DES PLAINES, ILLINOIS,)
JOSEPH SPELLONE (SPALLONE),)
and CAROL DOUGHERTY,)**

Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM ORDER

After this Court had made an extended effort to sort through the original Complaint in this action, which its ensuing January 20, 2015 memorandum order ("Order") described as "a hopelessly convoluted and really impenetrable document that is totally at odds with the mandate of Fed. R. Civ. P. ('Rule') 8(a) that says that a complaint 'must contain,' among other things, 'a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,'" the Order concluded by giving the plaintiff Vendetta Nagask Cece-Jackowiak ("Vendetta") until February 12 "to cure the flaws referred to in this opinion by tendering a self-contained Amended Complaint to replace her original Complaint, which is stricken for the reasons already outlined here." Vendetta is at least timely, for on February 11 she tendered a 2-1/2-inch-thick packet of documents comprising (1) an Amended Motion for Violation of Constitutional Rights (with the words "Amended Motion" being inserted in handwritten form in the Clerk's-Office-supplied form of Complaint made available to pro se plaintiffs seeking to advance 42 U.S.C. § 1983

claims), coupled with (2) a much shorter "Amended Property Rights Complaint" and (3) exhibit after exhibit that reproduce many documents from other sources, largely relating to other Vendetta lawsuits in several courts.

To borrow the felicitous turn of phrase from the per curiam opinion in United States v. Dunkel, 927 F.2d 955, 956 (7th Cir. 1991):

Judges are not like pigs, hunting for truffles. . . .

This Court has nonetheless engaged in a valiant attempt to repeat, as to Vendetta's massive (and largely irrelevant) current filing, what Order at 2 described as its earlier "painstaking effort to sift through its thicket in the hope of teasing out some rationality," but it has done so without success. In sum, despite the extensive experience that Vendetta should have derived from her numerous earlier lawsuits in various forums, she has again managed in this case not to demonstrate the existence of federal subject matter jurisdiction in an understandable way. Hence both the purported Amended Motion and the Amended Property Rights Complaint, as well as this action itself, are dismissed without prejudice.¹ Moreover, enough is enough -- if Vendetta were to try again with anything resembling what has gone before, this Court would anticipate exercising its prerogative under 28 U.S.C. § 294(b) to recuse itself from this action.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: February 18, 2015

¹ This dismissal carries with it the denial of Vendetta's currently filed collateral motions -- her In Forma Pauperis Application and her Motion for Attorney Representation -- on mootness grounds.